

fare carriers have increased competition, and have enabled more people to fly than ever before. Air traffic has grown as a result, and all predictions are that it will continue to grow steadily over the next several years.

In spite of the success of deregulation, many believe that competition can be improved. The competition provisions in the Air Transportation Improvement Act would ease some of the federally-imposed barriers that remain in the deregulated environment. These barriers include the slot controls at four major airports and the perimeter rule at Reagan National Airport.

Although this legislation is a positive step forward for our national aviation system, one of my main priorities, which is not included in the Air Transportation Improvement Act, will be to push for an increase in the Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) cap. We must address the widening infrastructure gap that threatens to hamstring our national aviation system. The independent National Civil Aviation Review Commission and the GAO also estimate that there is a backlog in airport improvements of approximately \$3 billion per year. To ensure that our infrastructure deficit can be met, we must look for innovative solutions such as a PFC increase which allow local control and responsibly for improving our national aviation system.

I look forward to working with Senators MCCAIN, HOLLINGS, and ROCKEFELLER to ensure that our common goals of providing a safe and secure aviation system for both commercial airlines and the general aviation community as well as providing adequate resources for the FAA to carry out this task are met.●

RECOGNITION OF BERNICE BARLOW

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable person from Saginaw, Michigan, Mrs. Bernice Barlow. Mrs. Barlow is leaving her position as president of the Saginaw branch of the NAACP after thirty years.

As president of the Saginaw NAACP, Bernice Barlow has been a powerful advocate for equality and civil rights. Although her tireless efforts on behalf of the NAACP are admirable in their own right, Mrs. Barlow has not confined her community service to the NAACP. She has also served with distinction in leadership roles with organizations like the Saginaw Education Association, the Tri-County Fair Housing Association and the Saginaw County Mental Health Board.

Despite her retirement from the presidency of the Saginaw NAACP, Bernice Barlow will continue her service to the people of Saginaw. Her husband, Charles, and her four children will surely be pleased to have more of her time, but I have no doubt that they will support her continuing efforts to ensure that equality and justice are

recognized as the birthrights of every citizen.

Mr. President, I am confident that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Bernice Barlow as she steps down from her position as president of the Saginaw NAACP, and in thanking her for her longstanding commitment to the people of the city of Saginaw.●

FOREIGN TRAVEL OF SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER

● Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, during the winter recess, I had the opportunity to travel from Dec. 12 through Dec. 31, 1998, to 13 countries in Europe, the Mideast and the Gulf. I flew over with President Clinton on Air Force One, spent the first several days in Israel essentially working with the President's schedule, and then pursued my own agenda when he returned to Washington. I believe it is worthwhile to share with my colleagues some of my impressions from that trip, which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Jan. 19, 1999, the first day for statements in the 106th Congress.

ISRAEL

From December 12 through December 15, I traveled with President Clinton to the Middle East to encourage the advancement of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process in the wake of the accords reached in October at Wye Plantation. Although somewhat overshadowed by the pending impeachment process, the President's trip was useful, I believe, in applying pressure to both sides to abide by their commitments toward further progress.

SYRIA

When President Clinton returned to Washington, I proceeded to Damascus, Syria, where I met with Syrian President Hafez al-Assad, to examine the possibility of progress on the Israeli-Syrian track of the Mideast peace process. While I believe that progress between Israel and the Palestinians could be made with the resumption of a dialogue between Israel and Syria, the pending Israeli elections have rendered the prospect for that dialogue unlikely in the short run.

The big news while I talked with President Assad was the increasing tension between the United States and Iraq over the U.N. inspection of Iraq's weapons program. Because Syria shares a long border and cultural heritage—though certainly no great friendship—with Iraq, even the threat of military conflict between the U.S. and Baghdad produces immediate and tangible emotions among many Syrians.

That afternoon in December, the situation in Iraq seemed grave: the U.N. team had evacuated the country, and chief inspector Richard Butler was preparing to address the U.N. Security Council in an emergency session. I did not know that a strike was imminent, but President Assad and I speculated during our meeting on news reports

concerning what the immediate future might hold.

Past midnight in Damascus, CNN carried live footage of anti-aircraft fire and air-raid sirens in Baghdad, only a few hundred miles away. The President's remarks from the Oval Office followed shortly thereafter, and, after a short night's rest, I was asked to comment on the bombing to an expectant Syrian press corps.

I told the press the same thing that I told President Assad in the previous day's meeting: I had written the President on November 12 urging him not to order the use of U.S. force against Iraq without first obtaining Congressional authorization as required by the United States Constitution. I believe that a missile strike is an act of war, and only the Congress of the United States under our Constitution has the authority to declare war.

Had the President taken the matter to the Congress, as President Bush did in 1991, I would have supported it. I believe that Saddam Hussein is a menace to the region and to the world. I believe it is true that he is developing weapons of mass destruction, and that he has demonstrated a willingness to employ chemical weapons for the most destructive and terrible purposes. Clearly, some forceful international action has to be taken.

I said I did not believe the President acted because of the pending impeachment vote. I indicated that, in my opinion, the President acted because he had put Saddam Hussein on notice in the past, and Ramadan was coming, as the President explained the previous evening. I said that I believe the House of Representatives was right in delaying the vote for a couple of days while we commenced a military strike on Iraq.

Constitutional requirements aside, there is a practical benefit to seeking Congressional approval for acts of war. When a President has the backing of Congress confirmed by way of a recorded vote, his hand is immediately strengthened in the eyes of the world. Absent that imprimatur of support, America's enemies or would-be enemies are left to poke and carp at the propriety and the purpose of the military action. And the attendant Congressional debate helps to sharpen the aims and follow-on goals of any action. Winning Congress' approval requires a President to spell out exactly what he hopes to accomplish through military force, and it forces him to keep those goals within the bounds of reality.

A recorded vote on military authorization is healthy for the Congress, as well. It puts Senators and Congressmen on the spot, up-or-down, on a matter of pivotal importance in national policy: deciding whether the goals of a military action justify the price in the blood and sweat of our troops. It is simply too easy for Congressional critics to bob and weave around taking a position on a given military action. If a particular campaign takes a difficult